

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the consideration given this case to date. Applicant has now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's action, and respectfully submits that the application, as amended, is now in condition for allowance. As filed, claims 1-14 were pending. With the amendments above, claims 1-14 remain and are believed patentable over the rejections of record.

THE EXAMINER'S ACTION

In the Office Action dated February 13, 2004, the Examiner:
rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No, 5,974,453 to Anderson et al ("Anderson '453").

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office has rejected claims 1-14 as being anticipated by Anderson '453. In order for a reference to properly anticipate a claim, the reference must show each and every element of the claim. As amended, claim 1 calls for "converting the telephone number portion into a multiple level domain name identifying the device over a network, the multiple level domain name comprising a plurality of domains corresponding to the telephone number portion and a base portion, where the plurality of domains corresponding to the telephone number portion are arranged in an order corresponding to the telephone numbered portion." Applicant agrees with the Examiner's observation that the telephone number portion of Anderson '453 requires reversing the phone number (initially 011-123-456-7890) in observance of the convention that DNS names are resolved from right to left with the highest hierarchical or least specific portion of the name being furthest on the right (resulting in 7890.456.123.011.dir-con.com). See, for example, Col. 6, ln. 66 – Col. 7, ln. 4.

Differently, the claim as amended calls for the plurality of domains to be arranged in an order corresponding to the telephone number portion. Thus, the reference fails to teach each and

every element of the claim and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is believed to have been overcome.

Claim 7, as amended, calls for receiving a multiple level domain name at least partially derived from a telephone number portion where the multiple level domain name is arranged in an order corresponding to that of the telephone number portion. Anderson '453, on the other hand illustrates in Figure 5 the entry of a static identifier (e.g., 011-123/456-7890) which is then reversed and arranged to form a DNS device name (e.g., 7890.456.123.011.dir-con.com). The reference then cannot be said to teach the elements as claimed and, as such, the rejection is believed overcome.

Claim 10, as amended, calls for a multiple level domain name identifying a second device while preserving sequencing of the telephone number portion. Anderson '453 distorts the entered data such that it is nearly unrecognizable by a human user as being derived from a telephone number. See, for example, Col. 5, lns. 60-67.

Thus, because the primary reference fails to teach each and every element of the claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejections and pass this case to allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the case is now in a condition for allowance. While no additional fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary additional fees, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-2051, referencing Attorney Docket No. 26769-6.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 13, 2004

By:


W. Scott Harders
Registration No. 42,629

BENESCH, FRIEDLANDER,
COPLAN & ARONOFF, LLP
2300 BP Tower
200 Public Square
Cleveland, OH 44114-2378
(216) 363-4443